



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/560,068   | 06/05/2006  | Sophie Creux         | 26217               | 9849             |
| 22889  | 7590        | 05/07/2009           |                     |                  |
| OWENS CORNING<br>2790 COLUMBUS ROAD<br>GRANVILLE, OH 43023 |             |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
|  |             |                      | COLE, ELIZABETH M   |                  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 1794                |                  |
|  |             |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|  |             |                      | 05/07/2009 PAPER    |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/560,068

**Applicant(s)**

CREUX ET AL.

**Examiner**

Elizabeth M. Cole

**Art Unit**

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/5/09 has been entered.
2. Claims 1-6, 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification as originally filed does not provide support for the limitation that the composition is "contains no lithium oxide other than trace impurities". The specification at page 3 states that the composition contains no lithium oxide but that is not the same as "no lithium oxide other than trace impurities".
3. Claims 1-6,8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. It is not clear what is meant by "trace impurities", because it is not clear what values this encompasses.
5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1794

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and 102(e) as being anticipated by Lewis, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0092379. Lewis discloses a glass composition for forming into glass fibers comprising SiO<sub>2</sub> in amounts of 49-76 wt percent; Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> in amounts of 2-23 weight percent; CaO in amounts of 3-15 weight percent and MgO in amounts of 2-15 weight percent. See paragraph 0042t. The composition can be used to make glass fibers. The amounts anticipate the claimed amounts. The amounts of B<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, TiO<sub>2</sub>, Na<sub>2</sub>O + K<sub>2</sub>O, F<sub>2</sub> and Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> are below the maximum values set forth in the claims. See paragraph 0042. Lewis teaches amounts of lithium oxide of 0-9 percent. See paragraph 0042. Since Lewis teaches amounts which encompass the claimed ranges, Lewis also teaches the ranges and ratios set forth in claims 4-6,9-13

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and (e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lewis, U.S. Patent application

Publication 2004/0092379. Lewis discloses a glass composition for forming into glass fibers comprising  $\text{SiO}_2$  in amounts of 49-76 wt percent;  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  in amounts of 2-23 weight percent;  $\text{CaO}$  in amounts of 3-15 weight percent and  $\text{MgO}$  in amounts of 2-15 weight percent. See paragraph 0042t. The composition can be used to make glass fibers. The amounts anticipate the claimed amounts. The amounts of  $\text{B}_2\text{O}_3$ ,  $\text{TiO}_2$ ,  $\text{Na}_2\text{O} + \text{K}_2\text{O}$ ,  $\text{F}_2$  and  $\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3$  are below the maximum values set forth in the claims. See paragraph 0042. Lewis teaches amounts of lithium oxide of 0-9 percent. See paragraph 0042. Since Lewis teaches amounts which encompass the claimed ranges, Lewis also teaches the ranges and ratios set forth in claims 4-6, 9-13. Lewis does not disclose the T liquid temperatures, the claimed Young's Modulus, or  $T \log=4$ . However, since Lewis discloses a glass composition and yarn having the same components present in the same amounts, it is reasonable to expect that the material of Lewis would possess the claimed properties. Where applicant claims a composition in terms of a function, property or characteristic and the composition of the prior art is the same as that of the claim but the function is not explicitly disclosed by the reference, the examiner may make a rejection under both 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, expressed as a 102/103 rejection. "There is nothing inconsistent in concurrent rejections for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 and for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102." In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255 n.4, 195 USPQ 430, 433 n.4 (CCPA1977).

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct

from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1-6 and 8-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 12-15 of copending Application No. 11/722,039. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims a composition having the overlapping ranges of the same constituents which is useful for making glass fibers and yarns. Although the claims of US '039 include lithium oxide, it is present in amounts of 0.1-0.8 which indicates that the material is substantially free of lithium.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

10. Applicant's arguments filed 2/16/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

11. Applicant's amendments have overcome the rejection over Neely. A new rejection is set forth above.

12. Applicant argues that US '039 is not a valid reference against the instant application. However, the copending US application is not applied as a prior art

Art Unit: 1794

reference but in an obviousness type double patenting rejection, which does not require the copending application be available as a prior art reference. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

13. Applicant's arguments with regard to US '265, now US patent No. 7449243 are persuasive and the rejection is withdrawn.

14. Applicant's other arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth M. Cole whose telephone number is (571) 272-1475. The examiner may be reached between 6:30 AM and 6:00 PM Monday through Wednesday, and 6:30 AM and 2 PM on Thursday.

The examiner's supervisor Rena Dye may be reached at (571) 272-3186.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

The fax number for all official faxes is (571) 273-8300.

/Elizabeth M. Cole/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

e.m.c